

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14, 16,17, 19, 21-24, 27, and 29 are currently amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-29 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment.

No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-19 and 21-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 (hereinafter “Anuff”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0010598 (hereinafter “Bales”). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, in view of Bales, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,673 (hereinafter “Maslov”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-29 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Anuff, Bales, and Maslov. Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff, Bales, and Maslov, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-29. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-29 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff, Bales, and Maslov, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “forwarding information, from a first computer system to a second computer system, that configures the second computer system to display one or more graphical user interfaces that enable users of the second computer system to interactively construct software code representing portlets configured to generate information displays when included on the portal page.”

In particular, Anuff and Bales fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature recited in amended claim 1 of “forwarding information, from the first computer system to the second computer system, that configures the second computer system to display a second user interface in the one or more graphical user interfaces, the second user interface configured to receive layout information declaratively specified by the users of the second computer system during the interactive sessions with the one or more graphical user interfaces, the layout information indicative of at least one layout style from one or more layout styles presented by the second user interface for data from the data sources associated with the portlets being designed by the users.” Anuff simply discloses that users can personalize “the layout of the portal” in that the user can determine which modules appear and their order of appearance. However, Anuff fails to disclose that end-users or administrators can create or otherwise modify the code representing the modules themselves, hence, failing to provide any suggestion of a graphical user interface configured to receive layout information declaratively specified by users during the based on a selection by the user of one or more layout styles presented by the second graphical user interface as recited in amended claim 1. All of the disclosures in Anuff pointed to by the Office Action on page 3 relates to how the user or administration can “revise the layout of the portal,” “change which modules appear...as well as their order.” This merely has to do with arrangement of the pre-created modules within the page or selecting predefined options within the modules for viewing data. In contrast, users can create portlets as recited in amended claim 1 because the layout information as recited in amended claim 1 is indicative of a selected layout style of the portlet being designed by the user.

Again, Anuff fails to disclose or suggest that the end-user or administration can specify layout information to provide at least one layout style from one or more layout styles presented by the second user interface for data from the data sources associated with the portlets being designed by the users as recited in amended claim 1. Bales further fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Anuff because wizard 125 of Bales fails to allow the user to specify layout information during the interactive session where the layout information is indicative of at least one layout style from one or more layout styles presented by the second user interface for

data from the data sources associated with the portlets being designed by the users as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff and Bales fail to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Anuff and Bales, and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11 and 23 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-22, and 24-29 that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1, 11, and 23 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
61942636 v1